

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 18:10:29 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 16:44:24 -0500
Message-Id: <Pine.HPP.3.91.950428141744.10443L-1000000@atlas.ce.washington.edu>
From: "David W. Barts" <davidb@ce.washington.edu>
Subject: 1-tube regen ideas

I've read from time to time in this list people discussing how much fun they have building and listening to simple 1-tube regenerative receivers. Well, the bug to build one has bit me, and I have several spare type XXL triodes that would probably work very nicely.

Anyone have pointers to magazine articles on building one of these?

Thanks in advance,

David Barts N5JRN
davidb@ce.washington.edu

UW Civil Engineering, FX-10
Seattle, WA 98195

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 17:55:20 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 16:29:16 -0500
Message-Id: <9504282114.AA45390@acs6.acs.ucalgary.ca>
From: "Deane D McIntyre" <dmcintyr@acs.ucalgary.ca>
Subject: Re: 6EW6, Tube Manuals

In message <9504280946.aa29557@dbh483.dbh.com> writes:
> I'd appreciate it if someone could email me the specs for a 6EW6
> tube. My local resources are very light in tube data.

6EW6: (From RCA Receiving Tube Manual)

Sharp Cutoff Pentode
Base 7CM

Heater 6.3 V, 0.4 A

Max Ratings:

Plate 330 Volts Screen Grid 330 Volts Control Grid 0 Volts
Suppressor Grid 0V Plate Dissipation 3.1 Watts

Characteristics:

Plate 125 V Screen Grid 125 V Cathode-Bias Resistor 56 ohms
Plate Resistance 200,000 ohms Transconductance 14000 micromhos
Plate Current 11 mA Screen Current 3.2 mA

>
> Any suggestions on book titles and/or sources to build up my
> library? Local hamfests don't usually yield much in printed
> material and, unfortunately, Dayton is not on my agenda for the
> weekend. Thanks in advance for the help.
>

RCA Receiving Tube Manual (1959 Edition available as reprint from Antique Electronic Supply)

Sylvania Tube Manual (I was lucky last month and found a copy of the 12th (1962) edition with supplements to 1966 in a used book store)

Older editions of the ARRL Handbook

Tabulation of Data on Receiving Tubes, Handbook 103, National Bureau of Standards (1967).

73, Deane D McIntyre VE6BP0
dmcintyr@acs.ucalgary.ca

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 11:24:16 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 09:58:11 -0500
Message-Id: <9504280946.aa29557@dbh483.dbh.com>
From: id25@DBH807.dbh.com
Subject: <didn't bother with a subject>

I'd appreciate it if someone could email me the specs for a 6EW6 tube. My local resources are very light in tube data.

Any suggestions on book titles and/or sources to build up my library? Local hamfests don't usually yield much in printed material and, unfortunately, Dayton is not on my agenda for the weekend. Thanks in advance for the help.

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 09:13:42 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 07:46:52 -0500
Message-Id: <199504281236.IAA00767@cappuccino.eng.umd.edu>
From: Philip Gwynne McCoy <dgnova@Glue.umd.edu>
Subject: BRETING RECEIVER

Subject: Breting receiver

The diagrms for most of the breting receivers appear in riders publications.
If you don't know the model number, e-mail me a

description and tubes used. Breting made good receivers, but they also made low cost broadcast receivers as well. I have worked on the Breting 12 and 14 and have info on these receivers.

> Charles_D._Shinn.dallasxes@xerox.com
>From: Charles_D._Shinn.dallasxes@xerox.com
>Subject: BRETING RECEIVER

>BRETING RECEIVER. AS FAR AS I CAN TELL IT APPEARS TO BE RESTORABLE EXCEPT FOR

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 09:40:37 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 07:28:27 -0500
Message-Id: <Pine.3.89.9504272023.A132666-0100000@itsa.ucsf.edu>
From: harlan woodring <harlan@itsa.ucsf.EDU>
Subject: brief intro & ???s

Greetings to all!

Well, I just joined the list a few days ago and thought since I'm the new kid on the block I should go ahead and introduce myself and maybe ask a few questions.

I've finally evolved to where I have several hours free 3 or 4 evenings a week and would like to get on the right track here, as far as boatanchors are concerned. I've only been SWL for a month or so now and am anxious to take the next step towards Ham Radio. I figure that a boatanchor would be the most affordable AND I would probably learn a lot more about radios by being able to tinker and restore. Naturally I've got a thousand questions but will bite the bullet and ask only a few at a time.

I've been trying to subscribe to Electric Radio Magazine and have had no luck so far. Nobody at the local Ham stores here in San Francisco seem to have heard of it. Does anyone have a telephone # or a complete address for them?

Can anyone suggest a book list for all the basics like radio theory, tinkering on boatanchors, ham radio and boatanchors, etc.?

Anybody reading this in San Francisco who might be interested in maybe sharing some of their experience or even just shoving me in the right direction? I'm a quick learner (well, my XYL doesn't always think so). I live in the 94123 zip code area which is the Marina neighborhood, yeah, I know that's where the ground's a little squishy.

Anyway, I see that I've already rambled a bit. All advice and help for someone at the beginning of the journey appreciated.

Harlan <harlan@itsa.ucsf.edu>

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 17:20:23 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 15:54:16 -0500
Message-Id: <199504282046.NAA07114@hobbes.UCSC.EDU>
From: haynes@cats.ucsc.edu (Jim Haynes)
Subject: Buy receivers, build transmitters, philosophy

(skip this if you don't like philosophical discussion)

I remember a scrap of text I read somewhere, perhaps from a pre-WWII handbook, that amateurs tend to buy ready-made receivers and to build their own transmitters. This is consistent with the observation that of the 3 big ham equipment manufacturers of the period (Hallicrafters, Hammarlund, and National) only Hallicrafters was much of a transmitter manufacturer. I suppose just about all the manufactured receivers of the period were general coverage. I suppose the reason for this state of affairs was that making a general-coverage superhet receiver was considerably harder than making a ham transmitter.

Now after WWII there was all the surplus gear, both receiver and transmitter; and then we got the companies like Heathkit making kits for receivers and transmitters. And there were the Johnson transmitters, and others. Then when we got into SSB it was hard to make transmitters as well as receivers, especially multiband ones. We started to see the manufactured ham-bands-only receivers, and the transceivers. (Because if you go to a lot of trouble to make a stable VFO you'd like to use it for transmitting and receiving; and with SSB you'd like to have all the stations in a round table operating on nearly the same frequency, which a transceiver makes automatic.)

Of course some people were real craftsmen and did build their own receivers; there were receiver construction projects varying from simple to elaborate in all the handbooks. I remember the particular enthusiasm for the HBR-14 and HBR-16 designs, that were duplicated by lots of people. I guess one reason for this was the claim that these would outperform practically any commercial receivers; and another reason was that it was almost as easy to build as a kit, because you could get very detailed instructions.

I know I fit the pattern. My first receiver was a BC-348, followed by a Drake 2-B, and some other things. My first transmitter was a very hacked up BC-375, followed by a Canadian airplane transmitter, followed by one I built from a Handbook design.

Now we're open for discussion, examples, counterexamples, what have you?

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 19:13:44 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 17:47:40 -0500
Message-Id: <9504282226.AA26287@uvs1.orl.mmc.com>
From: padgett@tccslr.dnet.mmc.com (A. Padgett Peterson, P.E. Information Security)

Subject: RE: Buy receivers, build transmitters, philosophy

>I remember a scrap of text I read somewhere, perhaps from a pre-WWII handbook,
>that amateurs tend to buy ready-made receivers and to build their own
>transmitters. This is consistent with the observation that of the 3 big
>ham equipment manufacturers of the period (Hallicrafters, Hammarlund, and
>National) only Hallicrafters was much of a transmitter manufacturer.

Suspect that the reason may have been more market oriented, there have always (and particularly before the war when Europe was in turmoil) been more SWLs than Hams. Second, narrow frequency/limited power transmitters as dictated by the FCC for amateurs would seem easier to build than a multi-band general coverage receiver. Finally, an amateur TX was mostly an exercise in final output and antenna design while RX had no limits - given equal TXs the guy with the better receiver will make more contacts. Minor improvements were important while "improved" output risked a visit from the FCC.

But I suspect it was mostly just a bigger market. Even a novice could buy & use the best RX available, all it took was money.

Am not a ham but suspect the above (particularly the last point) is the most important.

Warmly,
Padgett

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 13:06:51 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 11:40:46 -0500
Message-Id: <199504281620.LAA18800@uro.theporch.com>
From: Jack Taylor <n7oo@hereford.ampr.org>
Subject: COMMAND SET DOCUMENTATION

While the topic of command sets is still warm, does ANYONE have a comprehensive listing of original govt/commercial documentation to share? These critters were incredibly common, but outside of amateur radio info, I've seen very little regarding repair and maintenance documentation.

73 de Jack

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 08:58:28 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 07:31:15 -0500
Message-Id: <950428001353_99154049@aol.com>
From: KDOHG@aol.com
Subject: Command Set List

The following is "starter" information in response to the question re: Command Sets. Info from Command Sets, Cowan Publishing Co., NYC Edited by

Wayne Green, c 1957.....

RCVRS:

FREQ RANGE	IF	SERVICE NUMBER
190-550 KC	85 KC	R-23, R-148, BC-453
520-1500 KC	239 KC	R-24, BC-946
1.5-3.0 MC	705 KC	R-25, BC-454
3.0-6.0 MC	1415 KC	R-26, BC-454
6.0-9.1 MC	2830 KC	R-27, BC-455
100-156 MC	12 MC	R-28

"A few 9 to 18 MC receivers were built but quantity production was never undertaken...

TRANSMITTERS

2.1-3.0 MC	T-18
3.0-4.0 MC	T-19, BC-696
4.0-5.3 MC	T-20, BC-457
5.3-7.0 MC	T-21, BC-458
7.0-9.1 MC	T-22, BC-459
100-156 MC	T-23

MODULATOR	MD-7, BC-456
DYNAMOTOR	DM-33, DY-8

And tons of other accessories-cables, mounts, racks, relays, etc, etc, etc., and etc..

Finally, to quote Wayne Green, W2NSD, "If you run into any problems or have any questions baffling you, just remember that several of the authors involved are now silent keys, others have by now forgotten that they ever wrote any article (on Command Sets), and the editor doesn't know up from down". 73, <bill, KD0HG>

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 09:51:45 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 08:25:40 -0500
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.950428060532.10931B-100000@coyote.rain.org>
From: "Ray L. Mote" <rmote@rain.org>
Subject: Re: Command xmtr/rcvr history anyone?

The classic article on Command Sets was "The Command Set Story" by Gordon Elliot White, in CQ for November 1964. A follow-up piece called "Command Sets" (same author) was in CQ in October 1965 and detailed the lesser-known accessory and auxiliary pieces. (Gordon wrote the Surplus Sidelights column for CQ, and he made the world of surplus accessible for this teenage Novice).

For N50FF: be sure to warn your friend that modifying a Command Set is now classed as a War Crime!

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 15:33:58 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 14:07:54 -0500
Message-Id: <01HPVHWUY74IA29V1J@RANDB.PPRD.Abbott.Com>
From: KANAMAA%AMGATE%MATRXA@randb.abbott.com
Subject: Cubic/Mil ham gear

>From: Kana, Michael (D9CY)
Date: Fri, Apr 28, 1995 1:57 PM
Subject: Cubic/Mil ham gear
To: bigboats
Howdy all

Thanks for the answers to my query. I was curious about the name after reading the 93 Jane's Military Communications book. Talk about a wish book for big boys! It would be nice if some of the companies in that book made ham gear. Talk about sturdy field day rigs....

73's de AA9IL
Mike Kana

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 17:38:15 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 16:12:06 -0500
Message-Id: <2FA15788@msmail.oafb.af.mil>
From: "Lazaroff, Michael S., MSgt" <LAZAROMS@quasar.oafb.af.mil>
Subject: Cubic/Mil ham gear

Well, they are certainly sturdy. If you apply the weight reasoning to call them "boatanchors," then some of that stuff definitely qualifies :). In the USAF I've used a Sunair GSB-900DX HF rig (vintage mid 1980's). Had dual VFO's, LED digital freq readout, 100w out, 1.5 to 30 MHz (oops, I mean Mc/s, excuse me!), etc. etc. It weighed about 90 pounds. Fantastic piece of gear for point-to-point fixed freq operations and certainly rugged enough to survive most anything short of a direct hit (and maybe even that!) but not a good Field Day rig. Turning a separate knob for each digit of a frequency and then having to use the "clarifier" because

it tunes

only to the nearest hundredth kc would not be fun in the ham bands if you're constantly tuning around (at least by 1995 standards).

Sorry for drifting away from the real subject, just couldn't resist commenting.

I'd love to hear from some of the folks who've been around longer than me (I was first licensed in 1972 but didn't become real active until late 70's/early 80's) about your experiences at past Field Days or contests with BA gear.

Let's keep the memories alive...

73 de Mike, KB3RG

>Subject: Cubic/Mil ham gear

>To: bigboats

>Howdy all

>Thanks for the answers to my query. I was curious about the name
>after reading the 93 Jane's Military Communications book. Talk about
>a wish book for big boys! It would be nice if some of the companies
>in that book made ham gear. Talk about sturdy field day rigs....

>73's de AA9IL

>Mike Kana

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 13:53:34 1995

Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 12:27:29 -0500

Message-Id: <01HPVEN5P6R6A2AVHS@RANDB.PPRD.Abbott.Com>

From: KANAMAA%AMGATE%MATRXA@randb.abbott.com

Subject: Cubic/Swan

>From: Kana, Michael (D9CY)

Date: Fri, Apr 28, 1995 12:24 PM

Subject: Cubic/Swan

To: bigboats

Howdy all

I heard that the Swan company referred to as Cubic Swan. I was wondering if this is the same Cubic that makes radios for Uncle Sam?

73's de AA9IL

Mike Kana

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 14:30:19 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 13:04:15 -0500
Message-Id: <Pine.3.89.9504281211.A2681-0100000@ozarks>
From: "C. Frank Gilmore" <fgilmore@ozarks.sgcl.lib.mo.us>
Subject: Re: Cubic/Swan

On Fri, 28 Apr 1995 KANAMAA%AMGATE%MATRXA@randb.abbott.com wrote:

> From: Kana, Michael (D9CY)
> Date: Fri, Apr 28, 1995 12:24 PM
> Subject: Cubic/Swan
> To: bigboats
> Howdy all
>
> I heard that the Swan company referred to as Cubic Swan. I was
> wondering if this is the same Cubic that makes radios for Uncle
> Sam?
>
> 73's de AA9IL
> Mike Kana
>
>
>
>
>

Merril Swan sold out his company and I am told it was to Cubic....and the Atlas division....somehow. Anyway he is back in business doing work on older Swans and Atlas units from his garage...or so I am told.

And of course there is a current Atlas on the market but I haven't talked to anyone who has used one so have no idea how good it is. Nice looking unit.

de K0JPJ ex-W5PVX ...--

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 14:44:45 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 13:18:28 -0500
Message-Id: <2FA15933@pcgateway.netrix.com>
From: cgould <cgould@netrix.com>
Subject: RE:Cubic/Swan

Mike Kana Writes:

I heard that the Swan company referred to as Cubic Swan. I was wondering if this is the same Cubic that makes radios for Uncle Sam?

73's de AA9IL
Mike Kana

Yes Mike that is the same company or I should say was... I think they are out of business or close to it. Someone correct me if I am wrong. I have a RT-1393 by the way ...
Some think it does not qualify as a BA because it has semiconductors in it. But I think we should also give consideration to weight. With it's 28volt power supply it comes in over 100 lbs.
73
de Chuck, N4YXW
ipyxw@netrix.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 15:23:52 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 13:57:45 -0500
Message-Id: <53347.owen@apollo.eeel.nist.gov>
From: "James C. Owen, III" <owen@apollo.eeel.nist.gov>
Subject: RE:Cubic/Swan/BOATANCHORS

In message Fri, 28 Apr 1995 13:18:53 -0500, cgould <cgould@netrix.com> writes:

> or close to it. Someone correct me if I am wrong. I have a RT-1393 by the
> way ...
> Some think it does not qualify as a BA because it has semiconductors in
> it. But I think we
> should also give consideration to weight. With it's 28volt power supply
> it comes in over
> 100 lbs.
> 73
> de Chuck, N4YXW
> ipyxw@netrix.com
>

If BOATANCHORS were classified only by weight (which is the only thing

that counts in a REAL boat anchor) then a Drake 2B wouldn't be a BOAT ANCHOR. We have to use other modifiers to classify electronic BOATANCHORS. Maybe scarcity of parts??? I'm still looking for a filter Cap for my 2B and try to find RTL and DTL logic. Maybe Age??? Solid State ages faster than Vacuum, again it easier to find a 6SQ7 than some of the early transistors and logic. Maybe a BOATANCHOR is what you want it to be--yeh that's it. If the oldest equipment you have is a TS450 then thats YOUR BOATANCHOR. Enjoy.
73 Jim K4CGY

James C. Owen, III
National Institute of Standards & Technology (NIST)
Bldg 225/B360
Gaithersburg, MD 20899
1-301-975-5623

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 13:05:18 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 10:22:21 -0500
Message-Id: <Pine.3.89.9504280914.A26263-0100000@indy3>
From: "Roberta J. Barmore" <rbarmore@indynet.indy.net>
Subject: Dayton info?

Hi!

I may have a last-minute chance to get to Dayton, by dashing over with a friend between weekend shifts, and sleeping on the way home.

There's just one problem: I can find Dayton, but where's the Hamvention? >blush< I've never been there; recall some mention of Hara Arena, but that means nothing to me. So if anyone's got rough info to get to the neighborhood of the site, I'd really appreciate it!

73,
--Bobbi

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 11:02:05 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 09:35:59 -0500
Message-Id: <199504281424.AA09713@teal.csn.org>
From: bcutter@teal.csn.net (Bob Cutter)
Subject: Drake 2A Companion

I have a very nice 2A that I would like to add a transmitter to. I am not familiar with the 2-line, what was used, did they use a common VFO like the 4-line?

Anything for sale?

73, Bob KI0G

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 11:37:46 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 10:10:49 -0500
Message-Id: <39423.owen@apollo.eeel.nist.gov>
From: "James C. Owen, III" <owen@apollo.eeel.nist.gov>
Subject: RE: Drake 2A Companion

In message Fri, 28 Apr 1995 09:36:33 -0500,
bcutter@teal.csn.net (Bob Cutter) writes:

> I have a very nice 2A that I would like to add a transmitter to. I am not
> familar with the 2-line, what was used, did they use a common VFO like the
> 4-line?

>
>
>

You have a fine receiver there but it doesn't transceive with anything. It was designed in the days before Drake had a transmitter (except maybe the TR-3 transceiver. Most people used it with what-ever transmitter they had. I used my 2B with a Heathkit DX100B (still have both). To get the best match I would suggest a Drake T4 line transmitter. My choice would be a T4XC. I wouldn't reject a T4XB or even an A if the price was right however a T4XC and AC power supply is easily found for about \$200-225.00 in excellent condition.

73 Jim K4CGY
James C. Owen, III
National Institute of Standards & Technology (NIST)
Bldg 225/B360
Gaithersburg, MD 20899
1-301-975-5623

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 12:54:56 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 11:28:50 -0500
Message-Id: <9504281613.AA11362@kali>
From: Andy Wallace <wallace@mc.com>
Subject: Re: Drake 2A Companion

----- Begin Included Message -----

>From: bcutter@teal.csn.net (Bob Cutter)
>To: Multiple recipients of list <boatanchors@theporch.com>
>Subject: Drake 2A Companion

I have a very nice 2A that I would like to add a transmitter to. I am not familar with the 2-line, what was used, did they use a common VFO like the 4-line?

Anything for sale?

73, Bob KI0G

----- End Included Message -----

When Drake repackaged the 2-line receivers and called it the 2-C, they made a transmitter to go with it: the 2-NT. It's a break-in CW rig that puts out about 75W, and contains just three tubes. It has a sidetone, and you can also adjust the power level. NIFTY little rig! I am going to try mine out with an MFJ indoor antenna gizmo this weekend.

The 2-NT will work fine with your 2-A, but you will have to run the sidetone output to the volume control on the 2-A. No big deal. Run RCA patch cords over for ANT and MUTE and you're all set. If all you want for now is CW, the 2-NT is fairly cheap (about \$100 in nice shape and it doesn't need a separate power supply) and like the 2-line receivers, it's a nice li'l rig.

--Andy

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 13:41:01 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 12:14:49 -0500
Message-Id: <Pine.3.89.9504281114.A26218-0100000@ozarks>
From: "C. Frank Gilmore" <fgilmore@ozarks.sgcl.lib.mo.us>
Subject: Re: Drake 2A Companion

Bob there was no companion transmitter to the early Drakes. The 2C finally had a small crystal controlled transmitter for Novice use which was quite nice for CW but no interconnection at all. Transceiving didn't begin until the R4/T4 and their later variations hit the market.

73, Frank
de K0JPJ ex-W5PVX-

I might add the Eico 720 transmitter and companion modulator and VFO were very popular to use with the 2A. When I was in the business I had lots of guys lugging those stations in to trade for their first sideband xcvr, usually an NCX-3.

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 14:03:44 1995

Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 12:37:37 -0500
Message-Id: <199504281724.NAA12210@altair.cs.unc.edu>
From: Nick England <nick@cs.unc.edu>
Subject: Drake 2A companion

For some reason, possibly because I envied a friend's station back in high school, I have always thought that the Johnson Ranger made a very fitting companion transmitter for the Drake 2A or 2B. They were contemporary rigs, both smaller than average, both with distinctive styling, etc. Somehow they just seemed like they belonged together.

A Ranger looks out of place next to a big receiver like an NC-300 or SX-101. A Drake 2A/2B looks out of place next to a big Valiant, but it is too sophisticated a rcvr to match up with anything other than a xmtr with plate modulation and built-in VFO. The Ranger is "just right".

regards,
Nick KD4CPL

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 15:03:01 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 13:36:56 -0500
Message-Id: <9504281828.AA11555@kali>
From: Andy Wallace <wallace@mc.com>
Subject: Re: Drake 2A Companion

----- Begin Included Message -----

>From: "C. Frank Gilmore" <fgilmore@ozarks.sgcl.lib.mo.us>
>To: Multiple recipients of list <boatanchors@theporch.com>
>Subject: Re: Drake 2A Companion

Bob there was no companion transmitter to the early Drakes. The 2C finally had a small crystal controlled transmitter for Novice use which was quite nice for CW but no interconnection at all. Transceiving didn't begin until the R4/T4 and their later variations hit the market.

73, Frank
de K0JPJ ex-W5PVX ...--

The 2-NT provides connections for sidetone, mute, and antenna (all RCA jacks) -- so there is certainly connectivity. What you don't get is slaving of the receiver _VFO_ ... but a kind BA soul gave me a ham mag article which details such a thing, and I may just give it a try. At least Drake put two sizes of crystal socket on the 2-NT front panel!

--Andy

----- End Included Message -----

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 09:06:22 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 07:39:41 -0500
Message-Id: <2FA0CCEA@smtpgate.rfc.comm.harris.com>
From: "Gable, Edward M" <emg@rfpo2.rfc.comm.harris.com>
Subject: RE: EchoPhone Radios??

--

I am now trying to find any information that anyone might have regarding an old Echophone receiver that I am going to try and restore.

- - ANY - - information would be GREATLY APPRECIATED!!!!!!

Dave: There are two Echophone series. One is a series of three metal cased shortwave/Ham receivers of very late 30's and 1940's, there were models EC-1, EC-2 and EC-3. The other series were early battery operated broadcast radios of the 20's. Which do you have ? I have all three EC's in my collection and some docs.

Regards, Ed K2MP @ Rochester

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 09:03:30 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 07:36:47 -0500
Message-Id: <199504281110.GAA03970@uro.theporch.com>
From: bgraham@tecnet1.jcte.jcs.mil
Subject: Looking for a Heath HV PS

Help! I need a Heath HV PS... the HP 23 or equiv.

(I'm lazy and the parts cost too much to build a PS)

<G>

73
Bill

N5LMX/DA1WG

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 09:09:00 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 07:42:11 -0500
Message-Id: <9504281124.AA11045@kali>
From: Andy Wallace <wallace@mc.com>
Subject: Re: Nixie tubes

----- Begin Included Message -----

>From: "penson" <penon@geom.umn.edu>
To: Multiple recipients of list <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: Nixie tubes

I remember that the Signal One CX7 used them. I have seen at least one other make of transceiver that used them...I'll be darned if I can remember the make...

Chuck

----- End Included Message -----

The Drake DSR-1 and DSR-2 (anyone want to sell me one?) used nixies, as did the HRO-600... And as for sources (does Newark or someone sell them nowadays?) some pieces of test equipment have them, and maybe you can get an otherwise dead unit at a flea cheaply. I used to use a Systron Donner voltmeter with nixies.

--Andy

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 16:05:52 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 14:39:48 -0500
Message-Id: <342CD45D81@sbii.sb2.pdx.edu>
From: RANDY@sbii.sb2.pdx.edu
Subject: Re: Nixie tubes

Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 07:42:15 -0500
Reply-to: wallace@mc.com
>From: Andy Wallace <wallace@mc.com>
To: Multiple recipients of list <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: Nixie tubes

----- Begin Included Message -----

>From: "person" <person@geom.umn.edu>
>To: Multiple recipients of list <boatanchors@theporch.com>
>Subject: Re: Nixie tubes

I remember that the Signal One CX7 used them. I have seen at least one other make of transceiver that used them...I'll be darned if I can remember the make...

Chuck

----- End Included Message -----

The Drake DSR-1 and DSR-2 (anyone want to sell me one?) used nixies, as did the HRO-600... And as for sources (does Newark or someone sell them nowadays?) some pieces of test equipment have them, and maybe you can get an otherwise dead unit at a flea cheaply. I used to use a Systron Donner voltmeter with nixies.

--Andy

Dear Andy,

Could not resist the temptation to comment on the DSR-1/2. I owned a nice one about 10 years ago but unloaded it after deciding that it was not really a very good receiver. All the reviews I had read claimed a "lab grade" receiver, highest Drake commercial quality, etc. In fact, the unit was comprised of poorly cabled, medium-grade PC cards strewn around the interior of an otherwise too large box. The AGC and overload performance was sub-standard, and the tuning frustrating, since the display and tuned range would wrap around but not toggle the next digit (MHz, 100KHz) - these had to be set manually. Finally the audio quality was not acceptable. I guess they are a must for Drake fans, but don't expect them to outperform a 2 or 4 series!

=Randy=
WB6MAI

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 17:46:44 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 16:20:40 -0500
Message-Id: <199504282111.0AA07124@hobbes.UCSC.EDU>
From: haynes@cats.ucsc.edu (Jim Haynes)
Subject: Nomenclature systems

If we ever get around to putting together an FAQ file or INFO file for this list, one thing that can go in there is a bunch about nomenclature systems.

The current military AN/xxx nomenclature is pretty widely publicized - I could type it in from a reference book if anybody wants it.

The older Signal Corps system is not one I've seen in print anywhere. I know SCR is "Signal Corps Radio" (what did they do about photographic and meteorological equipment for which they also had responsibility, and for non-radio communications equipment?) SCR-nnn is a complete set of something. Some are pretty obvious: JK for a jack, PL for a plug, HS for a headset. What is BC (Basic Component?) MC (Minor Component?) FT (fitting?) Seems like telephone switchboards were BD-nnn and the field telephone was EE-8. Do those have mnemonic explanations?

Then the older Navy system is even more unfamiliar to me. I know there are some receivers that start with R: e.g. RAK-7, RAL-7, RDB... But that's about as much as I know about it. TCS is the transmitter-receiver combination, isn't it. And of course the parts of a set have some designation like Cxxx-nnnnnnnn.

The FAA system seems to be Rx-n or Rxx-n for receivers, maybe it's Tx-n for transmitters, and CA-nnnnnnn for all kinds of miscellaneous things.

Collins seemed to use nxx-n or nnnx-n for most of their stuff; KWM-1 and KWS-1 are exceptions. Is there any system or meaning to the letters and numbers, or are they arbitrary? (We know for components, specifically mechanical filters, that it's F-nnn-xnn where the first nnn is the center frequency, the x is the package style, and the last nn is the bandwidth.

Somebody talked about Hallicrafters recently: transmitters are HT-nx and receivers are S or SX, the X meaning it has a crystal filter.

Seems like it would be good to pull this kind of stuff together into one place.

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 19:05:19 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 17:39:15 -0500
Message-Id: <01HPVPL2XB0IA29BC4@RANDB.PPRD.Abbott.Com>
From: KANAMAA%AMGATE%MATRXA@randb.abbott.com
Subject: RX/TX Philosophy

>From: Kana, Michael (D9CY)
Date: Fri, Apr 28, 1995 5:37 PM
Subject: RX/TX Philosophy
To: bigboats
Howdy all

Well, there seems to be a few folks to chat with who didnt go to

Dayton...

I strongly agree with the concept of the RX/TX combination for a couple of reasons (some of which were pointed out in the earlier posting...)

Probably the main reason was that it was much simpler to build the transmitter and buy a nice receiver. Plus, the new novice was limited to crystal control. This provided the frequency ref. Of course, the receiver was useful in the testing of the homebrew transmitter. As the young squirt progressed up the ladder and added the modulator, the receiver was the useful piece of test gear. Likewise, the transmitter was useful for providing a test signal for the receiver.

The advantage is lost of course with the transceiver. No surprises here....

One of the other great reasons to get a factory RX was that the older tube sets approached art masterpiece status in appearance. (I always liked the 'Art Deco' look of the Hallicrafters sets) Usually, the TX took up rack space next to the desk.

Plus the homebrewing aspect gave hams something to talk about as opposed to the usual RST/QTH/WX qso format heard often now-a-days.

Along with my boatanchoring hobby, I work with microwave communications gear. In this case, I like to have the separate RX and TX lashups because the components can be used for testing. I would hardly call my waveguide monstrosities 'art'. Modern art, perhaps ;-)) I use boatanchor parts for this stuff too... The final amp for my 3.4ghz station uses 416C tubes. Hardly state of the art. BTW, if anyone has a spare 416C or B kicking about....

Ok, enuf pontificating

73's de AA9IL
Mike Kana

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 15:48:08 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 14:22:03 -0500
Message-Id: <9504281912.AA07975@cen.com>
From: gc@fox.cen.com (Gary Chatters)
Subject: SSB history (Was: Re: Swan ssb transceiver)

>>

>>Could anyone help in determining the model number of the following Swan
>>transceiver?

[...]

>>

>>It is 40 meters single sideband only. Tunes 7.2-7.3 MHz only.

>

>Another poster has already identified this as the Swan 140. FWIW, the first
>ad I

>can find for it appeared in the July '62 issue of QST. Clearly visible in
>the ad photo is the 40M dial scale and the Swan 140 model ID.

>

[...]

>

>It sounds like you've got a neat piece of Swan history there.

>

This discussion got me thinking a little bit about
"The Good Old Days" of the early 1960's. As I recall that
was a time when hams were transitioning from AM to SSB operations.
I used a DX-60 to get on 75m AM and I wasn't exactly an oddity
running AM.

There was a lot of interest in moving to SSB operations, but
back in those days radios cost quite a bit more than they do today.
The Collins radios were out of most ham's price range, so
someone must have figured that there would be a market for
cheap SSB transceivers. Thus, we got the one-band Swan and
Heath rigs.

As SSB became more popular and people were willing to spend
more, we got the three band 80/40/20 transceivers. I think
Swan, Hallicrafters, National and WRL made the three band radios.

That was about three sun-spot cycles ago and we were approaching
the bottom which is why the 80/40/20 combination could be popular.
The higher bands didn't open much and, as we've discussed before,
160 was still mostly taken up by LORAN-A.

Anyone have any corrections or additions to this? Who else
made the one-band and three-band transceivers?

73,

Gary

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 16:35:54 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 15:09:49 -0500
Message-Id: <199504281956.AA177779014@hp.com>
From: Bill Standerfer <bills@hpsilwes.lvld.hp.com>
Subject: Re: SSB history (Was: Re: Swan ssb transceiver)

gc@fox.cen.com wrote:

>This discussion got me thinking a little bit about
>"The Good Old Days" of the early 1960's. As I recall that
>was a time when hams were transitioning from AM to SSB operations.
>I used a DX-60 to get on 75m AM and I wasn't exactly an oddity
>running AM.
>

Even in the mid to late 60's you could still run AM without too much complaining from the masses. I remember getting on 15 AM with my HQ-110 receiver and a kludged 813 AM transmitter in, umm, maybe '66 or '67. Most of the folks you had to talk to were on SSB and my worst fear was that the receiver would drift too much while I was transmitting and I wouldn't be able to find them again. After about '68 or '69 you'd better have your shields up if you tried to run AM much except on 160.

>That was about three sun-spot cycles ago and we were approaching
>the bottom which is why the 80/40/20 combination could be popular.
>The higher bands didn't open much and, as we've discussed before,
>160 was still mostly taken up by LORAN-A.
>

One other problem with the first transceivers was that many were deaf as a post on 15 and 10 (at least it seemed that way). It took a long time for technology to allow a really full featured, high performance receiver to share a box with a transmitter. Seems like Heath was one of the first just to allow a CW filter to be switched in on the SB-102(?) about 1969.

>Anyone have any corrections or additions to this? Who else
>made the one-band and three-band transceivers?

Well, Collins made a three band tranceiver in the early 60's, but the KWM-1 was 20/15/10. :-)

Bill

Bill Standerfer	*	Hewlett-Packard Company
CFI-A, IA, ME	*	Measurement Systems Division
bills@lvld.hp.com	*	Loveland, CO 80539
Baron N222AB - KF0DJ - Pikes Peak 253	*	970-679-2378

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 09:00:43 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 07:33:48 -0500
Message-Id: <Pine.3.89.9504280207.A3731-0100000@netcom2>
From: paul Veltman <veltman@netcom.com>
Subject: Re: Swan ssb transceiver

>
> It is 40 meters single sideband only. Tunes 7.2-7.3 MHz only.
> The only id on the front panel says "Swan SSB"
> Probably 1960s vintage.
> All tubes, no transistors.
> It has a single 6DQ5 final, so it is probably 50 to 75 watts rating.
> Separate power supply and speaker. I have a supply that I built which will
> run it, but not the original.
> The cabinet is 13" wide, 6" high, 11" deep. Silver gray front panel, top and
> sides are black wrinkle.
> There is a rubber stamped number on the back of the chassis, "130-2", might
> this be the model number?

Larry,

If I remember correctly, it is a Swan 140. Good single band tranceiver.

73

Paul WA6OKQ

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 10:49:22 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 09:22:56 -0500
Message-Id: <Pine.3.89.9504280849.A19711-01000000@ozarks>
From: "C. Frank Gilmore" <fgilmore@ozarks.sgcl.lib.mo.us>
Subject: Re: Swan ssb transceiver

On Thu, 27 Apr 1995, Kenan, Larry wrote:

>
> Could anyone help in determining the model number of the following Swan
> transceiver?
> If so, then perhaps I could then obtain a manual for it.
>
> Characteristics:
>
> It is 40 meters single sideband only. Tunes 7.2-7.3 MHz only.
> The only id on the front panel says "Swan SSB"
> Probably 1960s vintage.
> All tubes, no transistors.
> It has a single 6DQ5 final, so it is probably 50 to 75 watts rating.
> Separate power supply and speaker. I have a supply that I built which will
> run it, but not the original.
> The cabinet is 13" wide, 6" high, 11" deep. Silver gray front panel, top and
> sides are black wrinkle.
> There is a rubber stamped number on the back of the chassis, "130-2", might
> this be the model number?

>
> Thanks,
> Larry Kenan
>

You have a SWAN 140 which was the first in a long line of fine rigs. For whatever it is worth I had the first one to enter Missouri (was a dealer) and I never knew any mobile rig could be so much fun. I had owned the famous Gonset twins, among others, and thought they were great but that little 140 blew away the competition. Only weak link, as in most of Swans history, was the DC power supply. A couple of competitors made a fortune selling heavier supplies right through to the last models.

I did the unthinkable of making a few non-cosmetic mods (hidden) that could be easily removed. I am a mobile CW nut and the 140 needed a bit of help in that area....but still a great rig. It provoked Heath into bringing out their single banders which were OK...but nowhere in the same league.

73, Frank
de K0JPJ ex-W5PVX ...-.-

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 12:28:22 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 11:02:15 -0500
Message-Id: <m0s4sEP-002cnPC@spider.lloyd.com>
From: jml@spider.lloyd.com (Jim Lockwood)
Subject: Re: Swan ssb transceiver

At 08:26 PM 4/27/95 -0500, Kenan, Larry wrote:

>
>Could anyone help in determining the model number of the following Swan
>transceiver?
>If so, then perhaps I could then obtain a manual for it.
>
>Characteristics:
>
>It is 40 meters single sideband only. Tunes 7.2-7.3 MHz only.

Another poster has already identified this as the Swan 140. FWIW, the first ad I can find for it appeared in the July '62 issue of QST. Clearly visible in the ad photo is the 40M dial scale and the Swan 140 model ID.

>It has a single 6DQ5 final, so it is probably 50 to 75 watts rating.

The 6DQ5 is good for 100 Watts PEP input on SSB. That means Swan probably ran it at about 120 Watts. :-)

>There is a rubber stamped number on the back of the chassis, "130-2", might
>this be the model number?

I'd speculate that it's the production date.....130th day of 1962.

It sounds like you've got a neat piece of Swan history there.

73,

Jim - km6nk

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Apr 28 14:10:56 1995
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 1995 12:44:52 -0500
Message-Id: <9504281026.ZM14737@mechcad3.engr.sgi.com>
From: "Mark Glusker" <glusk@mechcad3.engr.sgi.com>
Subject: Weston OQ-3

I am looking for a manual and/or schematic for
the Weston OQ-3 tube tester. I will pay all
copying and postage costs.

Thanks very much!

--

Mark Glusker, glusk@engr.sgi.com